

REMARKS

The present amendment is responsive to the Official Action mailed September 2, 2008. A petition for a two-month extension of the term for response to said Official Action, to and including February 2, 2009, is transmitted herewith.

Claims 1, and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Publication No. 2003-242122 to Kazuhiro et al. ("Kazuhiro") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0012156 to Fukuda ("Fukuda"), and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/01588960 to Engberg ("Engberg"). Applicants traverse the rejections.

On pages 6-7 of the Official Action, the Examiner admitted that Kazuhiro and Fukuda fail to disclose:

information which includes a device ID and pass phrase; wherein the third identification includes a one-time ID. The one-time ID being generated in response to authentication of the third information processing apparatus and containing no information relating to the third information processing apparatus or the first information processing apparatus.

To overcome this deficiency, the Examiner relied on Engberg. Specifically, the Examiner recited:

Engberg disclosed the one-time ID (Engberg, [0451], [0459], Engberg disclosed one the creating one-time only identity key) being generated in response to authentication of the third information processing apparatus and containing no information relating to the third information processing apparatus or the first information processing apparatus (Engberg, [0451], [0455], Engberg disclosed that the one-time identity is created with response to authentication of ID in the system.

(Emphasis Added)

As amended, each of independent claims 1, and 26-29 include the recitation of the one-time ID being generated as a result of authentication of the device. Support for the

recitation can be found in the specification at, for example, [0180]. However, upon review of [0451], [0455], [0459] it is apparent that Engberg is merely disclosing a one-time-only challenge/response key based on a shared secret key and an agreed algorithm and a one-time-only identity key based on hints to a clients identity. Unlike the one-time-only identity key based on the client's identity and one-time-only challenge/response key based on a shared secret key and algorithm, applicants' claim recites a one-time ID based on authentication of the device. Thus, Engberg does not teach or suggest applicants' claim recitation. Accordingly, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he/she telephone Applicants' Attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested Amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: February 2, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

David R. Widomski

Registration No.: 61,555

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Agent for Applicants